

**Queen's University
Library**

KINGSTON, ONTARIO

PRESBYTERIAN UNION

AND

The College Question.

BY

AN ALUMNUS OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE.



PRINTED BY
WM. BAILIE.
1871.

3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038

For s
East to
kept ap
that he
body.
evolved
Provide
the bre
frontier
reproach
causes 1

Froude in his address on Calvinism remarks: "There are epidemics of nobleness as well as epidemics of disease." So, we may observe that at some periods epidemics of disunion prevail—at others, epidemics of union. Even a superficial observer of the signs of the times may discern that the present era is marked by a strong yearning for re-union among Presbyterians in every part of the world. May we not hope as well as pray for the day when Pan-Presbyterianism, no less than Pan-Episcopacy, shall see its scattered members assembled in one great family-gathering! In the Australian Colonies the Scottish immigrants sought for a time to reproduce in that remote continent the walls of division which separated the several sections of Presbyterianism in the land of their birth: but ere many years their national common-sense and Christian patriotism taught them that they owed allegiance to their new home as well as loyalty to their old, that they must live for the future and not for the past. A calm survey of the religious destitution sure to end in practical heathenism, that prevailed in the districts into which settlers were pouring, constrained them to sink their differences and form a phalanx of workers combined to battle with the common foe and more effectually overtake the spiritual wants of their countrymen in these new settlements. The result of this movement has been not merely union but unity—amalgamation as well as incorporation. In the United States the great river of Presbyterianism, which upwards of thirty years ago had divided and branched off into separate channels, last year became again a united and thus more powerful stream, imparting fuller and fresher currents of life to the country which it waters, and has thus been rendered a mightier power for the evangelization of that vast country. And now Canada has caught the epidemic.

For several years the opinion has been silently gaining strength from East to West, that the time had arrived when the differences that kept apart the two great divisions of Presbyterians should cease, and that henceforward they should carry on their great work as a united body. There had been a "time" for disruption, and Providence had evolved good from it; now was the "time" for reunion, and the same Providence appeared to be opening the way for a happy "repairing of the breaches." In many places, more especially in embryo towns and frontier townships, there might be seen a state of things which was a reproach to Presbyterianism and a scandal to religion. Two rival causes planted side by side struggled for existence. And what was the

inevitable result? A mere waste of power, a prodigal squandering of vital energies. There was presented the unseemly spectacle of a contest waged not against the worldly and ungodly elements that abounded on every side, but against the membership of one another. It partook of the character, and had inherent in it all the bitterness of a life and death struggle. Other denominations looked on and saw two ministers in process of starvation, worse still, saw the religion, which breathes love and peace and good will to men, starved by a condition of things, which engendered rancour and jealousy, and delight in the fall of others, which tended to confound zeal for a sect with zeal for the honour of God. Were these two struggling causes merged into one charge, one minister would be decently supported; mutual building up and not mutual pulling down would occupy the energies of the membership; and the other minister would be set free to go as a labourer into the destitute fields in the far West and North that now send to us in vain the Macedonian cry. Not only would more men be thus rendered available for these Mission Fields; but also more money for the maintenance of these Missionaries.

In view of these and other weighty considerations, practical men in both Churches at length took heart publicly to ask: "Can nothing be done to remedy this sad state of matters? Is it not our duty to remove the reproach so oft flung at us by the enemy; 'see how these Presbyterians hate one another?' Why waste our energies in civil war? Can any reason that will stand the fire of trial at the judgment day be shown, why we should not merge into one our now separate organizations, so as to form one powerful regiment and rally once more under the good old Banner of the Covenant? Superstition, ritualism, avowed irreligion are around us, everywhere active and aggressive; the vast North-West is opening its gates, into which will set at no distant day a full tide of immigration; and must Presbyterianism be crippled by its divisions and thus prevented from gaining that position in the Dominion for which its powers of usefulness so eminently fit it? Are its sons not called upon to prepare to assume the obligations imposed by this prospect so as to pour in Missionaries on the crest of each fresh tide of immigration into these new regions?" The confederation of the several Provinces into one Dominion gave a powerful impulse to this feeling. The sentiment that a union of all the Presbyterians in British North America was desirable at length ripened into the conviction that it was practicable; and with remarkable unanimity, the Supreme Courts of the four organizations into which Presbyterians are divided appointed Delegates to meet at Montreal, for the purpose of considering whether, in view of the many and vital points on which all were agreed, separation could any longer be justified. In the selection of the Delegates, one object among others seems to have been specially aimed at, that all shades of opinion should be fairly represented in the Convention. It was composed of men both of the conservative and advanced types of

thought
Scotland
landers.
Master,
be effect
would b
to prove
their de
inclusiv
prehens
"the Co
these m
suppose
negotia
Presbyt
land wi
of their
and sen
of these

We lo
supplem
threaten
Church
least, fr
by the
they w
employ
the opi
theoriz
new Ur
well ec
lishme
as the
in oper
the nu
and Dr
entitled
us that
to the
has be

Lest
Queen
hold to
the ne
it may
seems

thought; Free Church, United Presbyterian, Burgher and Church of Scotland; Old Countrymen and Canadians; both Lowlanders and Highlanders. These Delegates appear to have met in the spirit of their Master, animated with the resolute determination, that, if a union could be effected without sacrifice of principle on either side—such a union as would be productive of strength and not weakness—a union calculated to prove harmonious and durable, it should be effected. The result of their deliberations was the unanimous adoption of a Basis of Union, inclusive of all essential points, and at the same time tolerant and comprehensive. Supplementary to it was a resolution anent what is termed “the College question.” This also was unanimously agreed to by these ministers and elders, representatives of the several Churches, men supposed to possess the confidence and express the views of the several negotiating bodies. We have reason to believe that the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland will not repudiate but, on the contrary, cordially adopt the work of their representatives and the “assembled wisdom” of the Churches and send it down to Presbyteries, with a view to receive the approval of these Courts, preparatory to ratification by the Supreme Court.

We learn, however, with surprise and regret, that opposition to the supplementary resolution anent “the College question” has been threatened from certain influential quarters in the Canada Presbyterian Church. This opposition, we imagine, has arisen, to some extent at least, from a misunderstanding of the position on this question assumed by the Convention. That body may not have been; in fact, we think they were not sufficiently clear and explicit on the point. The terms employed to express their views appear unfortunately to give colour to the opinion entertained by the parties above referred to, that they were *theorizing*, not dealing with *facts*; proposing the establishment of a *new* University, not recognising a long existing, firmly established and well equipped Institution. That wide-spread objection to the establishment of a *new* University would be raised, we can readily conceive, as the belief is general that already too many University Charters are in operation, at least in the Province of Ontario; and to add another to the number would be to aggravate the evil. But Dr. Taylor, Dr. Topp and Dr. Snodgrass, leading members of that Convention, and therefore entitled to be heard with authority as to what was meant, have assured us that they did not propose to establish a new Institution, but referred to the University of Queen’s College in the clause to which objection has been taken.

Lest, however, opposition should still be made to the adoption of Queen’s University and College, *as* it is and *where* it is, so that it shall hold to the United Church the relation which it now occupies to one of the negotiating Churches, we publish this pamphlet in the hope that it may aid in clearing up some points on which a haziness of view seems to prevail.

As the exact nature of the relation between the Church and College has been apparently misconceived, let us distinctly ascertain what this relation is.

The University and College is governed by a Board of 27 Trustees. These gentlemen appoint the Professors and control the Institution. The Board is composed of the Principal, eleven other clergymen and fifteen laymen. The Clerical element is elected directly by the Synod. The lay members are chosen in the following manner. Each Congregation in the Church has the privilege of nominating triennially out of its own membership or the membership of the Church generally a representative, to be one of a list out of whom are chosen the requisite number. If any Congregation fails to elect a representative, the list from which the lay Trustees are selected is so much curtailed. Sometimes it happens that the same person is nominated by two or more Congregations. Through this machinery a Board is formed partly through the Synod and chiefly through the Congregations, composed of persons in whose character, judgment and orthodoxy the whole Church has confidence and who (it is assured) will on the whole rightly discharge the trust reposed in them. That during the last 30 years they have discharged their trust in a highly conscientious way, none can gainsay. *Denominational* the Institution may have been, *sectarian* it has not been. More than half the Students who have attended its classes were connected with other denominations; yet, while assiduous care over their moral and religious welfare has been evinced, not a single charge has ever been even insinuated that it was used as an engine for proselytising purposes. Such is the extent of the connection between the College and the Church. Even if it were only a Theological Hall, a Board of Trustees or Governors would be required, elected in some such way as the above. Its functions would be different only in this respect that, instead of having the appointment of seven or eight Professors, this patronage would be exercised in the case of only two or three.

We can see many strong reasons wherefore it would be advantageous to the United Church to have associated with it the University of Queen's College as it is; no weighty reason why the Church should not desire to have it, applying as it does, to be received not *in pauperis forma* but possessed of a valuable endowment.

This important question cannot be rightly understood unless we draw sharply and clearly the distinction between a University and a College. In the objections that have been taken to the proposal of the Convention, these two things seem to have been jumbled together, rendering it difficult to perceive whether the objectors are opposed to the connection of the Church with the University feature of the Institution, or with the Arts Faculty, or both.

What is a University?

A University is simply a Board, technically termed a Senate. This

Board
upon a
distinct
(that is
Educational
scientific
aminers
by the
have re
fied, th
a Degr

A Un
These
Univer
Oxford
throug
of Edin
has on
Ontario
Univer
College

The
Provin
Educat
granted
who ap
Confed
It is th
of the
Educat

Who
Cambr
ago, w
learning
many
results
agitati
Would
of Edin
all in f
that of
deemed
of the c
each c
regard
Philoso

Board prescribes a curriculum, lays down a programme of studies, fixes upon a standard to be reached by successful candidates for Academic distinction, and appoints examiners. It exists not for instruction, (that is the work of a College) but examination; not for imparting an Educational training or communicating information on literary and scientific subjects but for testing the results of this training. The Examiners, whom it appoints, examine such Students as may be sent up by the College or Colleges affiliated to it; and to such candidates, as have reached the prescribed standard and have thus been found qualified, the University awards a certificate of qualification in the form of a Degree.

A University may have affiliated to it one College or several Colleges. These may exist in one locality, or in places widely remote. The University of Oxford has 20 affiliated Colleges, all within the town of Oxford. The University of London has affiliated Colleges scattered throughout England and some of the Colonies. While the University of Edinburgh (prescribed in the Royal Charter of Queen's as its model) has only one College. *Practically* the last named form exists in Ontario. The University of Toronto has University College; Victoria University has Victoria College; Queen's University has Queen's College.

The writer is an advocate for more than one University in the Province. Not that he approves of the present condition of University Education in Ontario. Without doubt too many charters have been granted. They were accorded with a fatal facility to all and sundry who applied for them in the closing days of the *regime* which preceded Confederation. But Queen's is not responsible for this state of things. It is the *oldest* in operation. We wish then to be regarded as advocates of the *use*, not the *abuse*. The attitude of Queen's to the Higher Education of the country is that alone with which we have to do.

Who will say that England has not been the better of possessing Cambridge as well as Oxford? And these were founded centuries ago, when population was sparse. Look at Germany where higher learning flourishes more vigorously than in any other country. How many Universities has she, and we have yet to learn that injurious results have accrued from the multiplicity and variety of these—that any agitation has ever been set on foot for the concentration of them. Would any one in his sober senses propose to destroy the University of Edinburgh or Glasgow or Aberdeen or St. Andrew's, and these were all in full vigour when the population of Scotland was not larger than that of Ontario at the present day. To propose such a thing would be deemed a retrograde step. We believe that the educational interests of the country can best be advanced by having a variety of institutions, each characterized by some distinctive feature. Thus Oxford is regarded as the special home, as the chief patron of the Classics and Philosophy; Cambridge of Mathematics; London of the Natural

Sciences. Life and uniformity are very far from being synonymous. Hear Professor Seeley, the accomplished Professor of Latin in University College, London, one of the foremost educationists of the day (*vide* *Essays on a Liberal Education*, pp. 146): "Education, in fact, in England is what the Universities choose to make it. This seems to me too great a power to be possessed by two corporations, however venerable and illustrious, especially since we know them to have grown up under very peculiar circumstances, and to be fortified by endowments against all modern influences, good or bad. I wish we had several more Universities; I mean teaching as well as examining Universities. I hope that the scheme, which was announced some time ago, of creating a University for Manchester will not be allowed to sleep. I should like to see similar schemes started in three or four more centres of population and industry. Could any investment of money in philanthropy be less questionable at this time? Is there anything more undeniable than that our material progress has outrun our intellectual,—that we want more cultivation, more of the higher education, more ideas?"

The only country in the world which, so far as I am aware, has adopted the one-University idea is France. Arrayed against this is the practice of England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, &c., in the old world, and that of the United States in the new. The case stands France vs. the rest of the educated world. Canada! which is to be your model? University Education is one of those things on which very varied opinions are held, and there should be no cast-iron rule for each and all—no one mould into which to force our Institutions, else symmetry and uniformity may be gained at the expense of life, or at least of a healthy condition. Some look to *information* merely, and would confer a degree on any one who was able to pass a prescribed examination, though that might be the result of cramming and he had not attended college for a session. Others lay stress upon educational training and the advantages to be derived from going through a regular curriculum at a fully equipped Institution. Some esteem of highest value the ancient—others modern studies. One University favours the English—another the Scottish type of education. And as there are varying tastes and opinion, so there should be a choice of Universities. Monopoly is the worst foe of healthy education as of healthy trade. Competition stimulates and prevents stagnation. No true reformer should advocate a system that would crush wholesome rivalry and spirited emulation.

That a scheme of affiliation was not carried out some years ago is not the fault of the authorities of Queen's College. Such a Scheme was submitted by Principal Leitch to the Senate of the University of Toronto. That Board, however, was opposed to it mainly, we believe, from a fear that the representatives of the Colleges other than University College, in the Senate proposed to be formed, would swamp

those of
might h
as circu
continua
ing al
Grants
Queen's
general
as she
trust he
where t
represent
her wi
assured
of Exan

Pray,
accrue
scheme
high a
conferre
upward
gone to
session
invaria
always
Let us
degree
eclat th
months
Queen's
Edinbu
Univer

Now
contine
of the o
for the
argume
Canadi
wide-sp
one fou
to test
questio
likely
tem, a
Domin
would,

anonymous.

Latin in
ists of the
ion, in fact,
is seems to
s, however
have grown
by endow-
sh we had
examining
nced some
be allowed
ree or four
estment of
? Is there
has outrun
the higher

aware, has
inst this is
m, Switzer-
in the new.
Canada!
ne of those
ould be no
o force our
ned at the
me look to
e who was
e the result
on. Others
be derived
ped Institu-
ers modern
he Scottish
opinion, so
e worst foe
ulates and
system that

ears ago is
a Scheme
iversity of
we believe,
other than
ould swamp

those of that Institution. Into such a scheme of affiliation Queen's might have entered at that time with comparative safety to her interests as circumstances then were, inasmuch as a common interest in the continuance of the Legislative Grants would have been a tie, connecting all the Institutions thus interested. Now, however, that these Grants have been forever withdrawn, this tie has been sundered; and Queen's has little in common with these other Colleges in matters of general policy. Hence she could not rely on them as her natural allies, as she formerly did. In this changed situation, Queen's could not trust her interests with safety, at any rate with confidence to a Senate, where the preponderating influence would be wielded by the representatives of University College, an Institution that has long regarded her with unfriendly feelings. The Kingston rival could not be assured that fair-play would be constantly exercised in the appointment of Examiners.

Pray, what gain to the country, what benefit to Queen's would accrue from the surrender of her charter and her agreeing to go into a scheme of Ontario affiliation? A degree from Queen's has now as high a value, say at the University of Edinburgh, as would a degree conferred by a University of Ontario, were such instituted. For upwards of 20 years a succession of alumni from Queen's College have gone to finish their studies, or, after finishing them, take an additional session at the Universities of Scotland or Germany; and almost invariably they have earned high distinction. And these were not always men who occupied the highest position in the Canadian classes. Let us confine ourselves to the last six years. One carried off the degree of B.D. with distinguished honour. A second bore away with eclat the degree of Doctor of Science. And within the past three months a young gentleman, who came out No. 2 in the Pass List of Queen's won one of the chief prizes in the gift of the University of Edinburgh, his competitor being a First-class Honour Graduate of the University of London.

Now that the several British Provinces in the northern half of this continent have been united in Confederation, why do not the admirers of the one-University idea advocate the establishment of one University for the Dominion, to be called the University of Canada? The leading argument in support of their favourite idea, which these advance, is that Canadian Degrees would have a higher value—would receive more wide-spread recognition in the educational world, if there was only one fountain for Academic distinction, a uniform standard by which to test the qualifications of aspirants to these honours. Looking at the *questio vexata* from their point of view, if this end would be more likely to be gained by an Ontario University than by the present system, *a fortiori* it would be secured in a still higher degree by a Dominion University. Moreover, the adoption of such a scheme, would, we conceive, be attended with fewer practical difficulties

than the one proposed of having a single Degree-granting Board for the Province of Ontario. Such a scheme, we should suppose, the authorities of Queen's College might be disposed to take into grave consideration. We are of opinion, that she might safely trust herself to a Senate, in which seats would be allotted to the representatives of McGill, Dalhousie and Fredericton Colleges. The Scottish type of education pursued at Kingston would, in such a case, be likely to secure due recognition—the candidates for Academic honours whom she sent up to pass the ordeal of the Central Board of Examiners might reasonably expect fair and impartial treatment.

Even if the idea here broached became an established fact, and there came to be but one University for Canada, with affiliated Colleges scattered through the several Provinces from Halifax to Victoria—even in such a contingency, Queen's would require to preserve intact, and maintain in active operation that portion of her Royal Charter which grants power to confer Degrees in Divinity, as well as the Honorary Degree of L.L.D. To this prerogative the Corporation of the University attach great importance. Our ambition is to render the land of our adoption a fac-simile in all that is good of the land of our origin—to reproduce in Canada all that has tended to make Scotland what she is—to elevate it by diffusing higher education, imparted under religious influences, and making it accessible to the struggling son of poverty, as to the youth bred in the home of affluence or comfort. In stating this to be our aim, we mean no offence to Ulster Presbyterians; for them we regard simply as Scotchmen making their home in Ireland, as we are Scotchmen living on Canadian soil. In the interests of a Christianity that shall command the reverence of the Miltons of literature and the Newtons of science—animated by motives of the highest patriotism—following in the footsteps of Knox and Chalmers, we desire to keep up the standard of a highly educated as well as pious and devoted Ministry. Our pulpits must be filled with men of power—men thoroughly fitted to be champions of the truth, bulwarks for its defence in an age when the man of science assumes to sit in the chair of the scorner and shape a wreath of laurels for himself by plucking the crown of thorns from the brow of the Crucified One—men possessed of the versatility and scholastic resources of Paul, who could worst the Jews of Thessalonica by the use-polished sword of the Spirit taken from the armoury of Sacred Writ, and confront the philosophers of Athens with weapons purchased by the brain-sweat of his early years from their own poets. Our pastors must be men of erudition and culture, as well as skill in Bible lore. Such is the high aim at which we aspire. With any point short of this we must not content ourselves, nor come down to a low educational standard to accommodate ourselves to the wants of the hour. For we may rest assured that a meanly-equipped ministry will inevitably result in a poorly paid pastorate, and this will induce a

conditio
talent
lative in
many in
light es
are risin
tend to
live—the
leave th
the stud
tive my
the old
his day
L.L.D.,
acknow
acts as
intellec
what s
educate
of Scot
shall h
United
do not
Hence
such D
Colleg
recogn
theolo

Wen
tion w
by wh
by a M
and a
should
scribed
to edu
as to i
govern
policy
be to
will e
whole
plastic
that s
influe
garde

condition of things in our manses, calculated to repel the youth of talent and spirit. In these days of active research and speculative inquiry among the votaries of literature and science, who in so many instances are led away by the wisdom of this world to hold in light estimation the wisdom of the cross, the demands of the pulpit are rising every hour. Hence each and every inducement that may tend to stir up our ministers to keep abreast of the age in which we live—that may win them from turning their backs forever, when they leave the halls of their Alma Mater, upon the laboratory of the chemist, the studies of the naturalist, the disenchanting wand of the comparative mythologist, must be highly prized. Now it has been found in the old country that the hope of adding to his name in the mid-time of his days, or even in the evening of his life, those mystic letters D.D. or L.L.D., as a sign of high professional acquirements, or as a public acknowledgement of services rendered in the cause of Nature's God, acts as a powerful stimulus to the maintenance of a high degree of intellectual power and scientific culture among the clergy. And to what source for the attainment of these Degrees, can our Canadian-educated ministers naturally look? Not certainly to the Universities of Scotland, for these cannot be expected to know them unless they shall have acquired a world-wide celebrity. Not to those in the United States, as diplomas from the great majority of these Institutions do not secure a high meed of respect on this side of the St. Lawrence. Hence in any case it is an admitted necessity that the right to confer such Degrees, conveyed by Royal Charter to the University of Queen's College, must be strictly preserved, that thus an avenue to Academic recognition may be open to such of our ministers as have earned theological, literary or scientific distinction.

Were such a Dominion University established, we hold that affiliation with it should be open to all suitably equipped Colleges, no matter by whom founded or controlled; whether by the State, by a Church, by a Municipality or an individual. When any College presents itself and asks for affiliation, the sole conditions of admission insisted on should be that it conform to the uniform curriculum, adopt the prescribed programme of studies and have a Professorial Staff sufficient to educate up to the required standard. No question should be asked as to its connections. To refuse admission to it because instituted or governed directly or indirectly through a Church, were to pursue a policy of proscription, were intolerant in the last degree. This would be to place under a ban a very large portion of the community, who will entrust the higher education of their sons, when away from the wholesome influences of home—when the minds of these are in most plastic state and most susceptible of influence from the associations that surround them—only to men for the exercise by whom of a healthy influence over the religious principles of these, they have what is regarded by them as a sufficient guarantee. If these people are denied

the right of obtaining a Degree in Arts for their sons, because these have been educated at a College in which they have confidence—a College, moreover, that is endowed wholly out of private resources and receives not one cent from the public treasury—they will suffer from as illiberal and narrow a policy as that against which educational reformers in England are warring, the limitation of Degrees from the old Universities to those who accept the Thirty-nine Articles. A *no-church* shibboleth is as much a relic of the persecuting and intolerant spirit of the dark ages as an *all-church* shibboleth. Class legislation is abhorrent to the spirit of this country and age. What then are we to think of the dictation that would close the avenue to University honours against those who have received their education at a certain College, because it was connected with a Church, that is an association of professedly religious men; but would accord recognition to another College, though governed by men who had formed an association on the ground that they did not believe in Churches. Such theorists regard the connection of a Church with an Institution for higher learning as a species of educational small-pox. Carry out the principles of these to their legitimate issue, and they would recognize a Seminary founded and endowed by a Girard, whose charter breathed the strongest aversion to Clergymen and religion—a College founded and endowed by the Plymouthites, whose creed is a no-creed, who scout the name of a sect, and whose association is founded on the basis that they are not a church; while they would put the stigma of reproach and exclusion upon an Institution, no matter how efficient or popular—no matter how thoroughly it performed its work or how deeply it was seated in the affections of a large portion of the community, simply forsooth because it was founded, *endowed* and maintained in efficiency by a Church. We will tone down our indignation to the faintest shade and simply ask, would such a policy be calculated to further the interests of higher education in this Canada of ours—to secure University-bred men from *all* classes—to turn out the *largest number* of well-trained graduates for the service of the Country in every department of public life?

We hold that there is no standing-ground that can be maintained intermediate between the system at present in operation and one University for the Dominion. The advocates of the one-University idea rest their argument on the greater value that would thus be placed on Canadian Degrees—on the higher and more general respect that would be accorded to them among the savans of other lands. To be consistent, therefore, their energies should be directed to the attainment of this end, which might be secured by the joint action of the several Provinces. While Queen's might feel that her interests would not be endangered by the adoption of such a Scheme and that she could safely trust herself in a Senate, in which representatives of the Colleges already named had a seat and an influence; yet it is very evident that she would greatly prefer to maintain her separate individuality. There

are many
that we
ligion an
whose fu
certificat
grounds
retain th
lows. S
whole co
surrende
grees, th
consciou
her indi
Education
now a lo
in a man
their cla
ficial to
with wh
when th
her exis
been m
are in t
remune
tributio
Certain
would c
alumni
out tran
free to
possess
may de
applica
continu
been co
Scheme
not a fi
Provin
Her co
her En
giving
to the
to Pre
Queen
past th

Hav

are many reasons wherefore she should do so. Not, be it observed, that we believe there ought to be a necessary connection between religion and a University, regarding a University simply as a Board whose functions are to examine candidates for Degrees and award certificates of qualification in the form of Diplomas. It is on other grounds that we esteem it to be the duty of the Board of Trustees to retain their University Charter unimpaired. These are briefly as follows. Since the unanimous voice of their corporation, that is, the whole constituency of the Church, expresses the determination not to surrender in any case the power to confer Honorary and Divinity Degrees, they may as well retain the whole charter as it is. Queen's is conscious of having done as much as any Institution in the country in her individual capacity to elevate and impart a high tone to University Education. She has an honourable history of thirty years. She has now a long line of graduates filling useful positions in every profession in a manner fitted to reflect credit on their Alma Mater, to establish their claims to the Degrees which they have received and to be beneficial to the country. The affection which they bear to her, the pride with which they regard her has been recently proved in her trial-hour, when they rallied around her and nobly made sacrifices to perpetuate her existence. None of them is past mid-life—most of them have not been many years engaged in the great life-struggle—many of them are in the ministry, which in this new country cannot be regarded as remunerative in a pecuniary sense, and yet the aggregate of the contributions of 60 of her sons amounts to \$10,000, averaging \$166 to each. Certainly the considerations should be of very pressing importance that would constrain her to sunder the Academic tie that binds her to such alumni. Moreover, by remaining as she is, she is free to follow without trammels of any kind her own method of University Education, free to select the studies to which she attaches prime importance, and possesses unrestricted liberty to choose whatever crucial process she may deem best fitted to test the results of the Collegiate training which applicants for her Degrees may have received. At any rate let her continue as she is, until the Scheme of a Dominion University has been consummated. It is now too late in the day to propose an Ontario Scheme of affiliation. The time has passed for that, as she now draws not a fraction of her revenue from the Government Coffers of that Province. Queen's is a Quebec as much as an Ontario Institution. Her corporation extends over both Provinces. The contributions to her Endowment Fund have come from both sources;—Montreal alone giving upwards of \$26,000. Gentlemen! drop hobbies—cast theories to the winds—tell us plainly, what *practical* injury has accrued either to Presbyterianism, to University Education, or to the country, from Queen's University and College as it has been managed during the past thirty years. On you lies the *onus* of proving this.

Having discussed the University aspect of the question in its

several bearings, we proceed now to examine the Collegiate feature of the Institution.

Is it to the connection between the Church and the Arts' Faculty that objection is raised?

If the relation between these be severed, and the Arts' Faculty be divorced from all connection with the denomination that has founded and endowed it, what do the opponents of our policy propose to do with it? Sell it to the Government! Admit for a moment the very improbable supposition that the Church would be disposed to part with that which has materially contributed to make her a power in the land, would the Government be disposed to come down to the House with a suitable vote in the estimates for the purpose of purchasing it? If so, they would have also to do the same for Victoria and the other Colleges that now have denominational connections. Moreover, what would become of the munificent endowment that has lately been subscribed? This was raised mainly for perpetuating the existence of the Arts' Faculty under the control and management of the Church, and faith must be kept with the donors, or their money must be returned to them. Already, as we perceive by the calendar, 44 scholarships, of the value of \$500 each, and 175 nominations, of the value of \$100 each, have been paid up in full, amounting to \$40,000, and for these a *quid pro quo* has been guaranteed, in the form of free education to children or proteges in the Arts' Department.

It must be borne in mind that the University of Queen's College was founded by the Free Church portion of the C. P. Church as much as by ourselves. They were responsible equally with us for its initiation under its existing charter, in its present form and in its central location. If the tribute of praise be due to its founders, they can fairly claim a share of the credit. If, on the contrary, those were guilty of a blunder and a wrong, they must bear a portion of the blame. Why then should these or their ecclesiastical successors now seek for the first time to frame a new article of policy and condemn that which they helped to call into being? Is this course dictated in the interests of a desire for union? We have always understood that parties negotiating for a union, such as that proposed in this country, instead of erecting new barriers, sought rather to wear down those which already existed.

That the Canada Presbyterian Church has not denounced the connection of an Arts' Faculty with a Theological Hall for the more thorough equipment of candidates for their ministry can be shown from their records and their practice. The resolution moved in their Synod by Mr. Kemp, and seconded by Dr. Jennings, on June 12th, 1862, and carried by a majority vote, was clearly in opposition to what were called "sectarian grants"—was condemnatory of "the appropriation of the public funds for the maintenance or endowment of denominational colleges." This question has now been consigned to

the reg
bers of
formida
the last
the issu
but row
ceeded
had rep
selves a
usefuln
growne
more g
cause o
not rec
does sh
or to G

But
aim ve
with A
the pag
find th
literary

Why
Church
increas
to com
is an in

We
now te
were i
depart

The
been n
of the
most e
of our
minist
system
option
One w
or mar
To th
time a
nation
educat
ignore

the region of dead issues. In the contest for these "grants" the members of the Canada Presbyterian Church were our stoutest and most formidable opponents. The contest was hot and protracted; but in the last grand battle of the war we were beaten, and at once accepted the issue. Without delay we gathered up our energies, not dispirited but roused and freshened by the defeat we had sustained, and proceeded to do what our opponents, during the heat of the controversy, had repeatedly urged upon us—endow it out of the resources of ourselves and such friends as the Institution had, by a course of admitted usefulness, made for itself elsewhere. This movement has been crowned with remarkable success, and nowhere in Canada is there a more glorious monument to the liberality of a people in support of a cause on which they have set their hearts. Queen's College now does not receive one cent directly or indirectly from the public coffers, *nor does she ask it*. She has learned the vanity of trusting to "princes" or to Governments.

But this resolution of the C. P. Synod of 1862 was in its motive and aim very different from a condemnation of the connection of a Church with Arts' Chairs maintained out of their own resources. Why, on the pages immediately preceding the resolution above referred to, we find that the Synod *voted down* a proposition for "abolishing the literary course of Knox College."

Why did the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland make this extraordinary effort to maintain and increase the efficiency of the Arts' Faculty, so that to the generations to come it might be what it had been to the generation past. This is an important question. Let us seek to answer it.

We may premise our statement by the remark that Queen's College now teaches neither medicine nor law. Some years ago these Faculties were in connection with her. Now she has given up both these departments of study.

The professed object—the grand aim for which the Institution has been maintained is not to impart a University education to the youth of the Province generally, but to equip in such manner as we deem most efficient for the purpose young men in training for the ministry of our Church. We hold that the wants of the age demand a class of ministers who are not mere *specialists*. Hence we do not approve of a system of instruction, whose tendency, by its encouragement of options, is the manufacture of specialists. What is a specialist? One who from capacity or taste has a favourite study, either classics, or mathematics, or metaphysics, or the natural sciences, or history. To this one subject he is allowed to devote, wholly or mainly, his time and powers. Those subjects for which he has no natural inclination or desire, even though they may be the best adapted as an educational instrument, he is permitted to lay aside or comparatively ignore. Thus by concentrating himself on a department of study

which he can easily master, and not being constrained to grapple with those which may present formidable difficulties, but which will exercise his mind, he may become a scholar well versed in one or two branches, but he is not turned out a well-trained, thoroughly disciplined thinker. The tendency of such a system is to send forth from the halls of a College men with biased minds—marked by a one-sided development of intellect which is not healthy. We admire not a University which, by its mode of testing results, or a College which, by its method of instruction, encourages a system that looks chiefly to information, no matter how or where acquired, and not to education in the literal sense of that much abused term. Our ideal of a College for the proper preparation of candidates for the ministry is that of an intellectual *gymnasium*. How did the Greeks perfect the corporeal energies of their sons? Did they allow a youth to select any one of the gymnastic exercises that composed the curriculum of their physical education, and restrict his attention to that? No—for only *one set* of muscles would thus have been called into play. Vaulting, running, wrestling, throwing the discus—the round of all these varied exercises had to be taken by each, that vigour might thus be imparted to *all* the muscles of the body, that there might thus be developed the fleet foot and brawny arm, a symmetrical figure, a well proportioned and powerful *physique*. The analogy applies to the education of the mind. Its muscles must be strengthened by a *variety* of studies. From the Collegiate arena should issue a succession of athletes, who have had the bone and sinew of their mental frame indurated and trained by *several* classes of difficult exercises. Thus only can they come forth to the great battle of life with a muscular brain-power, enabling them to grapple successfully with the multiform difficulties which face a minister amid the seething inquiries of the nineteenth century. Thus only can we obtain Herculeases, fitted to combat the Hydras of error, offspring of that old serpent, the devil. To qualify our students for detecting the most delicate shades of meaning in the original Scriptures—to make them at home with the most intricate and complex processes of thought—to have the natural sciences presented in such a way as shall enable them to meet the objections to Revelation advanced from time to time by scientific skeptics—to furnish us with a thoroughly drilled, well disciplined body of champions for the truth, these are the grand requisites which the Church demands. To ensure this important object it is essential to have the supervision of their education from the beginning to the close of their Collegiate career. We want to be in a position to shape their Arts' as well as their Theological studies, so as to render these conducive to a thorough equipment for their future work. Now this end can best be secured by having an Arts' Faculty completely under our control. If the Church desires special attention to be given to certain subjects, e. g.—if she wishes the Greek New Testament to form part of the classical course,

or if she
metaph
eminent
she has

The b
an Arts
Church
operatio
ceded th
good as
was not
versity
Young
at the I
ment of
find the
having
duties a
Latin."
classes

Another
this. A
men, v
leave b
enter u
profess
hold on
time w
Then t
from w
From
catch t
portan
severa
format
capaci
fear th
we ex
Froude
student
his pro
opinio
Will n
"If so
believ
becaus

or if she is anxious that its legitimate place should be accorded to metaphysics and ethics, an intimate knowledge of which has so eminently tended to adapt the Scottish pulpit to the Scottish mind, she has only to express her wish and it will be at once attended to.

The best witness we can summon in proof of this advantage of having an Arts' Faculty in connection with us is the Canada Presbyterian Church. That denomination has at least one Arts' Chair in active operation in Knox College. In establishing that Chair they have conceded the principle for which we contend. One Professorship is as good as six for establishing the principle. They believed that justice was not done to the important department of Mental Philosophy at University College. Hence they have had to appoint and pay Professor Young to perform this work which they cannot get done to suit them at the Provincial Institution. In the Report of the Board of Management of Knox College to the Canada Presbyterian Synod of 1869, we find the following clause: "The Rev. George Paxton Young, A.M., having accepted the appointment of the last Synod, entered upon his duties and taught classes in Mental Philosophy, Elementary Greek and Latin." "Mental Philosophy, Greek and Latin!" Are not these Arts' classes?

Another motive which nerved us to maintain the Arts' Faculty was this. As a Church we hold it to be of vital moment that our young men, who have the ministry in view, should from the time they leave behind them the wholesome influences of parental control, and enter upon an Academic career, be under the influence and example of professors who, while profound scholars and successful teachers, also hold orthodox views in religion. Between the ages of 15 and 20, the time when most men enter college, is the most critical period of life. Then the mind is remarkably plastic—very susceptible of impressions from without—most liable to be moulded by surrounding associations. From those above him, even more than those around him does he catch the tone of his future character. Hence it is of exceeding importance that the Professors, with whom he is in close contact for several years at the era when his character and views are in process of formation, should be men of tried religious worth as well as of proved capacity for the responsible position which they hold. Not that we fear that a Professor may sneer at Revelation in his class room—not that we expect him to deduce Presbyterianism from geology, though Froude shows that Calvinism can be drawn from history. But if his students admire him for the brilliance of his genius or the clearness of his prelections, and if they know him to be either skeptical in his opinions, or utterly indifferent in his practice—then comes the danger. Will not his youthful and enthusiastic admirer be disposed to argue: "If so learned a naturalist—if so distinguished a savan as Mr. A. believes not in the Gospel doctrines, propounded from our pulpits, it is because there is not much truth in these." Bear in mind that the

abler the man, the greater is the danger of their imbibing his loose views on Revelation, not directly from his prelections, but indirectly, even unconsciously to him from his unconcealed opinions and undisguised attitude towards the Bible. Hence the necessity of providing ourselves with a guarantee for the appointment of suitable men to those positions where they are entrusted with such tremendous power for weal or woe. And what is that guarantee? Not the prescription of a test or requirement of an oath. A fig for such subscriptions as a security for orthodoxy! These are no reliable pledge that the Professor will exercise a healthy influence upon the student's maturing opinions and tone of life. That guarantee is the circumstance that the appointment of Professors is vested in a Board, whom we have nominated, and in whom we have confidence. We rest assured that, composed as this Board is, and reflecting as it does the mind of the Church, the members thereof will look well to the men whom they select—will consider their character and principles as well as learning—will be careful to fill the chairs at their disposal with such as give no countenance to the attempt to oppose Nature to Revelation, to divorce Nature from Nature's God. We venture on an hypothesis, by no means improbable. Suppose a vacancy were to occur in the chair of Natural Science in University College, and the Government of Ontario (in whom the appointment is vested) were to select one who would teach science in the spirit of a Darwin or Huxley rather than in the spirit of a Dawson, would the C. P. Church not be likely, in order to guard the Scriptural principles of candidates for their ministry from being undermined, to appoint a person in connection with Knox College to do for them that which they could not get done in a way to meet their wishes at University College, just as they have employed Prof. Young for the department above referred to?—We are much mistaken if they would not feel it to be their duty to do so. For, be it remembered, according to the principles of our opponents, according to the spirit of the University Act of 1853, Government, in examining the qualifications of candidates for the chair in question, would be bound to look simply at their scholarship and aptness to teach, without making their theological views or religious bearing an element in the consideration.

We may refer to another practical advantage which the Church derives from the connection with it of the Arts' Faculty. It has merely to be stated when its inestimable importance will be comprehended at a glance. The fact that our ministers, *ceteris paribus*, have a preference in appointments to these chairs is a powerful stimulus to them to keep up their literary and scientific attainments—is found to act as a lever for raising and maintaining the standard of a ministry marked by intellectual calibre, mental culture and scholarly attainments. Whereas under the system that has prevailed in Toronto for nigh twenty years, although the C. P. Church has contri d

half of the
social sta

For the
connectio
at least
mind, he
attend th
sued in a
homes to
perfect li
alumni o
aming
overwhel
rallied a
pecuniar
various
they sho
tages of
and pu
society,
scruples
views

We
determin
integrit
to hav
School
determin
unsect
the pas
manag
confide
sons w
if they
it more
the cl
barrier
come,
would
receiv
greate
formin
other
petitio
chara

half of the students, they have not one representative on the Professorial staff.

For these and other reasons the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland recognize the value of having at least one Arts' Faculty under their control. Let it be borne in mind, however, that candidates for the Ministry are not *obliged* to attend this Institution. If they prefer the system of instruction pursued in any other College, or if they find it more convenient to their homes to take their Arts' course at Toronto or Montreal, they are at perfect liberty to do so, and they receive the same treatment as the alumni of Queen's when they present themselves to the Synod's Examining Committee. No distinction whatsoever is made. While the overwhelming majority, at least nine-tenths, of our Church have nobly rallied around Queen's College, and have contributed, many at great pecuniary sacrifice, to its Endowment Fund, yet there are a few who from various reasons might prefer to send their sons elsewhere, and it is right they should have unrestricted freedom to do so. Hence one of the advantages of having a variety of Institutions, so as to meet diverse views, and put a University Education within the reach of all classes of society, all shades of opinion without violence to their conscientious scruples—with no ban placed on either their religious or irreligious views.

We have sketched the principal objects for which the Synod determined to maintain the University of Queen's College in its integrity. The inspiration of the movement was drawn from a resolve to have in connection with the Church at least one fully equipped School of the Prophets. While such was the case, they were equally determined to maintain not only the denominational but also the unsectarian character of the Institution in the future, as it had been in the past, with not a whit less of broad and liberal Catholicity in its management and instruction. If persons in other denominations had confidence in its government; if they were fully assured that their sons would there be under religious but not proselytizing influences; if they preferred the method of education there pursued; if they found it more convenient to their homes or less expensive to send to its halls, the classes of Queen's should be open to these without test or any barrier whatsoever. As during the past 30 years, so in all time to come, a hearty welcome would be accorded to them. The fees of such would aid the revenue of the Institution. Our own students would receive the educational advantage arising on the one hand from the greater fire imparted to the Professors from the enlarged number forming a more powerful battery of electric enthusiasm, and on the other hand from the increased emulation caused by more spirited competition. The highest tribute that can be paid to the unsectarian character and liberal management of Queen's College is the fact that

more than half of its alumni have belonged to denominations other than that with which it was connected.

So much for the maintenance of the University of Queen's College *as it is*. Let me now make a few remarks with reference to the maintenance of it *where it is*.

Surely no valid objection can be raised to its present situation. The site is in its favour rather than otherwise. It is central, occupying a position midway between Quebec and Sarnia, or, if you will, between Newfoundland and Manitoba. It is easily accessible by rail or steamboat. The town is healthy. The cost of living therein is moderate. Kingston may not be a large place—hence it is all the better adapted for a College. Its City-hall is not the theatre of a never-ending succession of concerts and evening entertainments, and thus fewer temptations to dissipation of time are presented to those who are constitutionally indolent, or who by temperament are easily led away from grave studies to unseasonable recreation or frivolous amusement. The busy hum of business—the crowded streets—the ceaseless stir of dense population are not congenial haunts of study. Take away the Universities, and what would be left of Oxford or Cambridge? Glasgow, the largest and busiest city of Scotland, cannot be quoted against us, inasmuch as Glasgow, for three centuries after its University was established, was not more populous than Kingston now is. Look at the Continent of Europe. Heidelberg possesses only 12,000 and Halle 29,000 inhabitants. What principle seems to govern our American neighbours in the selection of Collegiate sites? Hartford, the seat of Yale, prides not herself on busy hives of manufacturing industry. Are Andover and Dartmouth famed as marts of commerce? Large cities, like New York and Philadelphia, by their teeming hospitals and ample materials for furnishing an able Professorial staff, may attract the followers of Aesculapius, but what educational establishments, except their medical schools, have won a Continental fame? The recently founded Cornell University has its home in Ithaca, a village in central New York. Take the practice in this matter of the Presbyterian Church of the United States. Princeton, the site of their oldest and leading Institution, is not larger than Perth or Whitby. Of their other colleges, Danville, Union, Western, Hamilton, Lane, Union, and North West, only one is situated in a large city. Moreover, Queen's College owns and occupies *immovable* property to the value of \$40,000.

Some have proposed to remove the Institution to either Montreal or Toronto. These cities certainly possess many attractions, and present powerful inducements to such a course; but the disadvantages arising from this step would more than counterbalance the advantages. Apart from other objections—such as the multiplying of Universities in places where one is now inadequately supported, and the leaving Central Canada entirely destitute of facilities for acquiring a Collegiate

education—
would cano
sional atm
money-mak
15 or 16, h
and cultur
money, th
chief end
men, in w
education
lated to in
a lawyer,
too poor
for eccles
Montreal
churches

In the
up *nothi*
may be
the Chu
and ind
to many
severan
which l
this sac
of Presb
the adv
to be ca

In t
not on
oppon
think
them i
their a
of wh
were t
we de
This
scribe
\$80,0
hand
with
King
mem
proo
Quee

education—there is one specially fatal to the project. In neither city would candidates for the ministry be surrounded by a healthy professional atmosphere. In Montreal young men are regarded as mere *money-making machines*. So soon as a youth arrives at the age of 15 or 16, he is not sent to College so as to have his mind disciplined and cultured, but thrust into a mercantile office with a view to earn money, that being regarded as the *summum bonum* of existence—the chief end of man. In Toronto, while a larger percentage of young men, in what is termed *good society* (i.e. *rich society*!) seek a Collegiate education, they are surrounded with influences and associations calculated to impress and foster the idea that a professional man should be a lawyer, perhaps a doctor, certainly not a minister. This is altogether too poor a business for a youth of talent and spirit. Here is a question for ecclesiastical statisticians—how many of their ingenuous sons have Montreal and Toronto furnished to the ministry of the several churches?

In the proposed Articles of Union the C. P. Church are asked to give up *nothing whatsoever*. We have to give up, in order that the union may be consummated, our time-honoured and close connection with the Church of Scotland, together with the many advantages, direct and indirect, which that connection implies. This will cost, at least to many, a very great sacrifice of feeling. It involves not merely the severance of ties of sentiment, but also the sundering of associations which have gathered around them the heart's tenderest fibres. Yet this sacrifice, great as it is, we are prepared to make in the interests of Presbyterianism, of the future of our adopted country, and especially the advancement of Christ's honour and kingdom. But ought we to be called upon to give up more?

In the controversy on "denominational grants" the C. P. Church, not only as individuals, but as a Church, were our most formidable opponents. They won the battle. They secured the triumph. And I think we may safely say that we cherish no hard feelings towards them in consequence of this, as we believe that they were prompted to their action in this matter by conscientious motives, by the dictates of what they conceived to be a principle. During the controversy we were taunted with meanness in taxing the public funds to support what we deemed a principle and told to endow it out of private resources. This we have just done. Upwards of \$100,000 have already been subscribed, and the movement is yet far from being completed. Over \$80,000 of this amount have already been paid into the Treasurer's hands. Of the whole amount subscribed at least \$90,000 (the balance, with the exception of about \$1,000, being contributed by citizens of Kingston belonging to other denominations) have been given by the members and adherents of our own Church, thus furnishing practical proof both of their own beneficence and of the strong hold which Queen's College has on their affections.

And now when we are flushed with victory—when we rejoice in the thought that our School of the Prophets, though beaten and driven out of the Provincial Legislature, has found a warm home in the hearts of our people, and of kind friends in other denominations, who have learned to appreciate her worth—when we are in the act of contemplating with gratitude and just pride this crowning monument of the Church's spirit and liberality; are we to be told that we must overthrow that monument and level it with the ground, before the other branch of the Presbyterian Church consents to form with us a union? What! must we not only part with our name, but also destroy our grandest trophy? Is this not asking too much? Has this not the appearance of a desire to humiliate; and can an honourable, harmonious or durable union result from the previous humiliation of one of the parties to it. Were the branch in connection with the Church of Scotland to consent to do what some have asked them to do in this matter, and I a member of the C. P. Church, I would refuse to cast in my lot with persons so craven and mean-spirited. For if, as a separate body, they would prove so recreant to what they hold to be a principle, they would prove equally recreant to other principles in the United body.

Why is all this sacrifice demanded from us? Simply to gratify a theory of some, which the C. P. Church have never erected into a principle—yea, which in its leading feature they deny in practice, as witness the case of Professor Young's chair, already referred to. Moreover, we have always been of opinion that when two parties are negotiating a union, there should be "give and take" on both sides—mutual compromise. When one party proposes then to erect, for the first time, a new principle, this cannot be regarded as indicative of a desire for union. What is practical, not mere theory, should be aimed at. This it is which mainly distinguishes Anglo-Saxon sagacity, and especially hard-headed Presbyterian shrewdness from French dreaming and sentimentalism.

It was said of a certain interpreter of the Parables that he saw Christ everywhere in them, even in the most remote allusions—of another, that he saw Christ nowhere. In like manner the Roman Catholic Church insisted on a union of the Church with everything under the sun; now there is a revulsion from this doctrine to the opposite extreme, that would divorce the Church from connection with every instrument of civilization, save the simple ministry of the word and ordinances. The true safety and welfare of men, we believe, lies in this as in most things, in the golden mean. The great battle which the several Churches have to wage in these days is a defensive warfare against a spurious liberalism—a real latitudinarianism. By all means let us accept with open hand what is broad, catholic, comprehensive; but, at the same time, we are required to guard against the secularizing tendencies of the age, which, under the cover of warring against

Paritanical doctrine, ma
are a young
exercised in re
jealously a
Church and
gather less
posed in pr
on the part
their Theo
Seminary,
In the pro
Church of
ed by the
them to la
Hall," in
Church, a
President
single ser
has just
the Pres
interests
Queen
Church
ergies.
affirm,
facts de
in the
'versity
been g
the er
Morrin
and er
peals
oontri
as by
cupie
has it
and t
Ou
the l
the c
aries
vers
it h
it e

Puritanical narrowness and bigotry, would undermine Puritanical doctrine, masculine devotion, and the good, old-fashioned piety. We are a young Dominion. Too much care and vigilance cannot be exercised in regard to the character of our Institutions. While we guard jealously against the mistakes of European countries, which unite Church and State in closest relations, let us look across the border and gather lessons from their experience, where such relationship is opposed in principle and practice. There we find a growing disposition on the part of the Churches to have Arts' classes in connection with their Theological Halls. At Princeton there is not only a Theological Seminary, but also an Arts' College, called the College of New Jersey. In the proceedings of the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States (May 23rd, 1870), we find a letter addressed by the Faculty of this Institution to the General Assembly asking them to lay the corner-stone of a new building to be called "Re-union Hall," in honour of the re-union of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church, and from a speech delivered on the occasion by Dr. McCosh, President of the College, we quote: "Mr. Moderator, permit me in a single sentence to express my thanks to this Assembly for the action it has just taken. I wish to make this College closely associated with the Presbyterian Church, and the means of promoting the great interests of religion."

Queen's College does not knock at the door of the proposed United Church with a view to cast herself as a burthen upon its financial energies. The Institution is now comparatively well endowed. And we affirm, without meaning any offence to other Canadian Colleges, that facts demonstratively show that no College is more deeply implanted in the affections of a people. It is the offspring of the masses. University College is the creation of the Legislature. Not one cent has been given directly by the people towards its endowment. McGill is the erection of a few wealthy and liberal merchants of Montreal. Morrin is the work of one man. Whereas Queen's has been established and endowed by the personal liberality of the multitude. Three appeals for Endowment have been nobly answered. The first in 1840 contributed by those who afterward formed the Free Church as well as by ourselves. The second in 1855 when the buildings it now occupies were purchased. And the third, not yet completed. Thus it has its foundations broad and deep in the heart of our Church at large, and this is the Institution which we are asked to cast adrift!

Our motto then is "the University of Queen's College at Kingston"—the Institution *as it is* and *where it is*. We do not ask our friends of the other Church to make any change in the relation of their Seminaries to the United Church. Ours is the oldest Arts' College with University powers in operation in the Dominion—we have fostered it and it has been a source of strength to us: and we do not mean to sacrifice it even for the attainment of an end so vastly desirable as Union.

Let the resolutions of the Conference, unanimously agreed to by the chosen representatives of the other body equally as by ours, be adopted; and we vote heartily for the Union—we raise both hands for its consummation. We will be prepared as a Church, I believe, to accept the result of the deliberations of the assembled wisdom of the Churches convened at Montreal in September last.

But if otherwise—if a majority or formidable minority of the Canada Presbyterian Church insist on Queen's University and College and us parting company before they consent to form along with us a grand "Presbyterian Church of British North America," then we must with a sigh bid farewell to the hopes we had cherished, and throw on them the responsibility of "forbidding the banns."

APR 1
128